

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended to point out a preferred embodiment of the present invention related to the purification of an aqueous hydrogen peroxide solution first with a reverse osmosis membrane and, afterwards, with at least one other purification selected from the group consisting of exposure to ultraviolet light, exposure to ozone, and contact with at least one adsorption resin. Support for these amendments is found throughout the specification and in original Claims 2, 4, 5 and 8. New Claims 15 and 16 are supported at specification page 2, lines 19-23. No new matter has been entered.

In amending the claims and the specification the Examiner's concerns expressed in the 35 USC 112 rejection have been addressed, and a new drawing has been submitted deleting reference to "Figure 1."

The prior art rejections are traversed.

Devos fails to disclose the invention as presently claimed. While Devos at column 2, lines 4-7 describes various techniques that may be used to purify a hydrogen peroxide solution, this general discussion of techniques in no way discloses or suggests the specific combination of purifications required by the amended claims, or their order of application. Moreover, the actual process of Devos is limited simply to contact with a resin bed. See, e.g., column 3, lines 38ff of the reference. Because nothing in Devos discloses or suggests the particular combination of reverse osmosis membrane purification followed by at least one other purification selected from the group consisting of exposure to ultraviolet light, exposure to ozone, and contact with at least one adsorption resin, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection over Devos is no longer applicable to the pending claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Minamikawa does not make up for that lacking in Devos. Minamikawa simply discloses a process wherein an aqueous hydrogen peroxide solution containing impurities is

brought into contact with an anionic exchange resin in the fluoride form. See, e.g., the Abstract in column 4, lines 1-15 of the reference.

Because even the combination of Devos and Minamikawa fails to disclose or suggest the presently claimed process, the rejections over these two references singly and in combination should be withdrawn.

Finally, the rejection of Claims 10-12 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above and in view of the above amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)